

VOLUME 21

NUMBER 4

PRICE 8p

Christian Order



MAY 20 1980

Summary of Contents for April, 1980

PE AND THEOLOGIANS

The Editor

OTHER TERESA IN OSLO

Philip Caraman, S.J.

EBLA : PROMOTION OF JUSTICE

A Summary

E NEW CHRISTIANITY : A SNARE
D A DELUSION

Anonymous

CAUSE FOR DISSATISFACTION

Adrian P. Kilroy

CULARIST REVOLT WITHIN THE
URCH

The Editor

PRO FIDE

(Southwark Branch)

FATHER PAUL CRANE, S.J.

(Editor, *Christian Order*)

on

“Building the Church with Pope John Paul II”

at

St. Mary's Junior School, Sydenham Road,

Croyden, Surrey

on

Friday, May 9th at 8 p.m.

All Catholics cordially invited

Enquiries to the Secretary :

Cedric W. Sander, Esq.,

26, Beaconsfield Road,

Bickley,

Kent BR1 2BP

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Contents

Page

- 194 POPE AND THEOLOGIANs
The Editor
- 196 THE NEW CHRISTIANITY:
A SNARE AND A DELUSION
Anonymous
- 208 MOTHER TERESA IN OSLO
Philip Caraman, S.J.
- 212 JOHN RANDAL BRADBURN
John Dove, S.J.
- 221 LITURGY: THE NEED FOR
ORDER
Frank Morris
- 223 SECULARIST REVOLT
WITHIN THE CHURCH
The Editor
- 236 A CAUSE FOR
DISSATISFACTION
Adrian P. Kilroy
- 342 PUEBLA: PROMOTION OF
JUSTICE
Summary
- 252 BOOK REVIEW
Francis Messiter

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia—£4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 21

APRIL, 1980

NUMBER 4

Pope and Theologians

THE EDITOR

FREEDOM of choice is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end. Man is free to choose. He has the right to choose. Because totally dependent on God, he remains under obligation to set his choice within the context of God's truth. For the Catholic this means submission—free not forced—to the teaching authority of the Church, which has the duty of upholding, guarding and proclaiming divinely revealed truth. Teaching authority within the Church is not vested in the theologians, but in the Pope and Bishops in union with the Pope. The latter would be doing less than his duty, therefore, if he failed to call to order theologians or others within the Church who called divine truth into question or denied it publicly, expressly or by implication.

Like any other member of the Catholic Church, the theologian is bound to the free acceptance of divinely revealed truth. The honourable and logical thing for him to do if he rejects that truth is to leave the Church. The dishonourable and illogical thing for him to do is to remain within that Church whilst calling into public question the truth God has entrusted to it and which he, as a member, is bound to accept. To claim licence for this stance in the name of "academic freedom" merely by-passes the point—that divine truth is received, not made by men. Their duty

—and that of the theologians in particular—is to probe its riches. Had the theologians been faithful to this task during the past fifteen years, the Catholic Church would have been spared the confusion and the heartbreak that beset it today.

A splendid letter in the *Times* (5/1/80) from a Protestant Minister, the Reverend N. M. de S. Cameron, puts the matter far better than I could ever do. I quote :

“... may I voice the secret envy that many Protestants must feel for the present vigorous discipline at work in the Roman Catholic Church? It is a thousand pities that the churches of the Reformation have discarded their historic concern for truth and are pusillanimous in their refusal to deal with even the rankest heresy in their midst.

“But we cannot escape the logic of revelation. Revelation implies truth, truth implies orthodoxy, orthodoxy implies heresy. If we baulk at the idea of discipline, then we implicitly abandon our birthright that the Christian faith is a revealed faith, and that Christian truth is something other than simply the accumulated wisdom of Christian thinkers. If God has revealed Himself in Scripture and in history, then that deposit of revelation must be safeguarded and preserved.

“And it is this that shows up talk of ‘human rights’ (whatever that phrase may mean) as the red herring it is. If men do have fundamental rights, their only ground is their bestowal in the hand of God. It was Adam who first considered that he had the right to believe what he chose; and, as we all know, he was unfortunately mistaken. Learned theologians who deny truths that are integral to the Christian revelation have no God-given ‘right’ to do so. On the contrary, it is the Church which has not only the right, but the duty to discipline them and prevent them from influencing others. For a century Protestantism has refused that duty. Shame on us that the Church of Rome has not.”

Catholics can only thank God that Pope John Paul has begun a task so long overdue. In his prosecution of it, all but a tiny dissident minority within the Church will give him the support of their prayers. Meanwhile, they look to the Bishops, in particular, to follow his example.

This article appeared several years ago in *Christian Order*. Its significance has increased with the years. It is for this reason that the decision has been taken to reprint it. It points unerringly to secularism as the major danger confronting the Church today; the root of the confusion that besets her from within. Recent articles by Dr. Eric de Saventhem and by Father Paul Crane, S.J. in comment on Professor Hitchcock's, *Catholicism and Modernity* point in the same direction.

The New Christianity a Snare and a Delusion

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

THE very influential and highly esteemed religious Review *La Civiltà Cattolica*, published by the Jesuits in Rome, carried a remarkable article in its issue of March 16th, 1974, pp. 521-528. The article was remarkable not only for its assessment of events today within the Church but also for its sense of urgency regarding the temptation provided by the new "Christianity". The author—doubtless the editor of the Review, though his name was replaced by 3 asterisks—shows how a new "Christianity" is in process of developing, a Christianity which not merely challenges, but even denies the essential truths of authentic Christianity. While retaining, for the most part, the usual theological language, it empties it of its true meaning, of its very substance and defends doctrinal errors directly opposed to the Gospel—which, however, it constantly quotes: it is in fact, an anti-faith. Moreover, by posing as the defender of the poor and oppressed against the injustices and oppression of the powerful, it is able to exert an insidious attrac-

tion for the young, especially the generous-hearted young, and for those attracted by revolutionary Marxism.

THE NEW CHRISTIANITY

Catholics Who Oppose the Church

To the onlooker, the Catholic Church today appears to be divided. The factors which bring the divisions to light are many; they are known to everybody since press, radio and television give them full coverage. Thus, there has emerged within the Church a "Catholic Opposition" composed of many differing groups of "dissident Catholics" or "critical Catholics" as they like to call themselves.

A First Type of Argument

What, in fact, lies behind such a phenomenon? In other words, what is it that divides Catholics today, over and above polemics concerning "the social option", the supposed riches of the Vatican, the collusion of the Church in matters of politics and economics?

As we see it, the primary cause of the division does not appear to lie in any practical consideration such as what the Church and Christians in general should do, for example, in order to follow the Gospel more closely. It is true that this is the theme to which critical Christians revert time and time again; and the most serious, the most cruel accusation they make against the Institutional Church is that she is unfaithful to the Gospel because she does not come down in favour of those options demanded of her, as they think, by the Gospel; instead, she prostitutes her mission by bowing before the strong, the powerful and the rich, upholding and giving her blessing to a capitalist system, which exploits and crushes the poor. Nevertheless, in our opinion, this is not the most important or radical cause of present divisions within the Catholic Church, even though it is around this argument that disaffection towards the Institutional Church is most easily crystallized.

Radical Confrontation in the Dogmatic Field

In our opinion, the root of present divisions amongst Catholics lies in the theoretical, theological field; or, in simple words, in dogma. Indeed, it seems to us that, during the past few years, a new "Christianity" has come into being, a different Christianity, which can be distinguished from traditional Christianity, not only by its newer manner of posing certain problems, or by opening out new theological perspectives; but by reason of its central aim, which is to "reinterpret" the Christian Faith in a humanist, secular manner in order to make it more "meaningful" and interesting for modern man, since traditional Christianity, according to the reinterpreters, no longer means anything to him.

Contestation with Regard to Truths of Faith

It is important to notice that this new "Christianity" derives from felt needs which are completely legitimate in themselves. It tries to resolve a real problem, which is widespread today. But, instead of trying to arrive at a valid synthesis of the traditional and the new, it casts into the background, if not completely denies, the essential elements characteristic of the Catholic Faith. In other words, it dilutes Christianity by laying such stress on certain of its aspects that, to all intents and purposes, it denies others which are equally essential, if not more so.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE NEW "CHRISTIANITY"

In order to enable the reader to gauge the accuracy of this assessment, a detailed examination of the outstanding and significant characteristics of this new "Christianity" must be made.

Anthropocentrism: Man-Centered Religion

The first characteristic is most certainly anthropocentrism. For the new "Christians" it is no longer God Who holds the central place: it is man; and it is on man that they concentrate their entire attention and interest. Not that God is denied, but He is seen as in man and functioning as

man. He is not loved and served in Himself and for Himself. The love and service of God are reduced to the love and service of man. The first commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, with thy whole strength", has been transformed into the second commandment, "Love thy neighbour", which becomes not the second but the only commandment. Thus, the primacy of man is substituted for the primacy of God. God exists, but He exists in man (which, for some, means man is God). As a result, the love of one's neighbour ceases to be, as St. John describes it, a sure sign of one's love of God. It has become, instead, the sum-total of "Christianity". The true Christian is no longer the Christian who loves God with his whole heart and who, for love of God, loves his neighbour and sacrifices himself for him; the true Christian is he who becomes involved in the world through his love of men and in them alone sees the true face of God. For this reason, true prayer consists not in seeking God in solitude, but in placing oneself entirely at the service of one's neighbour. Traditional prayer is regarded as a flight from work in the world entailing the risk of sterile introspection and preoccupation with one's own petty spiritual problems.

Over-Emphasis on the Present World

Another fundamental characteristic of this new "Christianity" is involvement to the point of absorption in the world. Whereas the emphasis of traditional Christianity is placed on the future world and eternal life in God and awaits the full realization of His reign on earth at the end of time, the new "Christian" places the whole emphasis on this world and asserts that the Kingdom of God must be fully realized here below, within the context of history. The salvation purchased by Our Lord's death and resurrection will not be achieved in some mythical, way-beyond world but here, on this earth. It will consist in the liberation of man, his liberation from the evils which oppress and alienate him and which prevent him from becoming truly free—ignorance, hunger, underdevelopment, political oppression, economic exploitation. Thus, the principal evil from which man must be liberated is not personal sin but "social sin"—the present unjust social and political struc-

ture, which enables one set of people to subject and exploit the others, must be recognised for what it is. At this present stage in our history, this social sin can be identified with the capitalist system, which, aiming as it does at profit-making, of its very nature alienates and exploits. Thus, to fight against capitalism is to fight for the true liberation of man, and hence for the coming of the Kingdom of God upon earth. Because both Christians and the Church have a duty to work for the coming of the Kingdom of God, they have the duty to fight against capitalism and against imperialism. However, since socialism alone is capable of waging a successful attack on capitalism, those Catholics who wish to take part in the liberation of the poor and oppressed must opt for socialism, and, as a result, fight for the triumph of socialism throughout the world. Only the Christian who is committed to the liberation of the poor vis-a-vis capitalism and who opts for socialism is acting in accordance with the Gospel, which proclaims liberation for the poor; this type of Christian, and he alone, is worthy of the name.

A False Evangelism

The third characteristic of the new "Christianity" is evangelism in the sense that the new "Christians", both in thought and action, take their inspiration solely from the Gospel (*Evangelium*), and exclude all reference to Tradition and, especially, to the authoritative teaching of the Church (Magisterium). This exclusion of the Church and her teaching by the new "Christians" in their interpretation of the Gospel derives less from the Protestant principle of private judgement than from the clearly Marxist principle that the economic structure of a period determines its religious and cultural superstructure. From which it follows that the Church's interpretation of the Gospel, not only in the past, but also today, is misleading in that she interprets the Gospel in a bourgeois and capitalist manner. In fact, in the eyes of the new "Christians", the Church not only lives within the capitalist system, but is deeply involved in it, with the result that her rendering and interpretation of the Gospel is influenced by capitalist ideology. The exact opposite, they say, should be the case. She should

take the stand on the side of the poor and adopt the views of the oppressed; that is, of the proletariat. The Gospel belongs to the poor and it was to them alone, the new "Christians" say, that Christ announced it. Consequently, it is only the poor and those who take their stand at their side and fight for them, who can truly understand the Gospel.

A New Ecclesiology

A fourth characteristic of the new "Christianity" is the new Ecclesiology: the following are its chief aspects.

- a) No distinction, still less a separation, can yet be made between "Church" and "World": the Church is not only in the world; she is the world.
- b) The Church does not exist for herself; she exists for the world, to serve the world. She must not, therefore, seek to impose herself, to further her own prestige by making pacts with the powers of the world or by creating specifically Catholic institutions. She must efface herself by serving the world, and placing herself at its service. From now on, she must cease having her own Catholic institutions, which, moreover, invariably become centres of riches, of power and of the exploitation of the poor. She must be seen to be poor: strong only in the strength of her prophetic and liberating power through the Word of God. Then, and then only will the poor — and in particular the working-class — feel at home within the Church.
- c) The Church is essentially a fraternal communion in which all members are equal, assembled together through the Word of God, which must constitute the norm for every judgement, every action of the members of the Christian community. It is the community which will nominate and choose those of its members whom it wishes to act as "ministers" of the Word and of the Eucharist: at the same time, the priesthood itself continues to lie within the capacity and remains the prerogative of the whole community. As a result the community can celebrate the Eucharist even without a "minister".

- d) The Universal Church is the fraternal communion of local churches, which consist of small, obscure, "grass-root" communities, gathered together through the Word of God, faithful to the Gospel and to the poor.
- e) The Catholic Church in its present form of "rulers" (hierarchy) and "ruled" (the people of God), with its institutions of domination and power; in collusion with political Powers, through concordats, and with capitalist exploitation, which she covers with the cloak of religion and from which she receives in return substantial benefits, is radically unfaithful to the Gospel and has become the enemy of the poor, in whose oppression and exploitation she actively participates. For these reasons, individual Christians and Christian communities, who wish to remain faithful to the Gospel, find themselves obliged to disassociate themselves from the Church, unless they are prepared to remain and act within it as a leaven of criticism in order to convert it both to the Gospel and to the poor.

Passionate Devotion to Christ as Man

The final characteristic of this new "Christianity" is a passionate devotion to and faith in Christ; not Christ the Son of God Who was made man (the Christ of Catholic theology), but rather the Christ-man, the Christ for others, the Christ who was the friend and defender of the poor, the liberating Christ seen as a revolutionary.

ANALYSIS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS

If we now examine each of the characteristics of the new "Christianity" we shall immediately see that, while affirming justly felt needs which were, perhaps, somewhat neglected in the past, essential points of Christian Faith are either glossed over or denied.

Anthropocentrism: Man-Centered Religion

Thus, with regard to *anthropocentrism*, a justifiable, present-day need is met by exaggerating charity and service to man to the point where God is eliminated altogether or reduced to the status of man. As a result, Christianity becomes a "religion of man"; in effect atheistic, even

though the name of God is retained. It becomes a religion of the second commandment. Such a diminution is in radical opposition to the Gospel which teaches the primacy of God and of His love and sees in Him the source and cause of the love and service of one's neighbour. If man is worthy of love, it is because God loves him, and has accepted him as His son. If particular honour and service must be given to the poor man, it is because God loves him in a very special way; and in the Person of Christ has put Himself at his service and identified Himself with him. Without love of God, Christian love of man does not make sense.

Over-Emphasis on this World

The same can be said of the second characteristic of the "new Christianity": over-emphasis on this world to the point of integration with it. It is right to oppose a certain limited, individualist concept of Christian spirituality centred exclusively on eternal salvation; it is right to affirm the value of the world and of history; it is right to say that the Kingdom of God must be striven for in this world. But this is no justification for pushing optimism concerning the world and history to the point where both become divinized, so to speak and, above all, it must not cause us to lose sight of the fact that the full realization of the Kingdom of God is not on this earth, but in Heaven. The true destiny of man will not be fulfilled in this world, which passes like a series of pictures on a screen, but in life eternal. There and there only will justice and love triumph because God will be our all in all.

A False Evangelism: Salvation and Liberation

It is right to affirm that salvation includes liberation from the evils of this world, for Christ came to save the whole man in the whole of history, soul and body, spiritual values and material values. However, salvation cannot be reduced solely to liberation from the evils of this world: that would be to forget that, for Christ Our Lord, the radical evil was separation from God through sin, from which the evils of this world spring and are its natural consequences. This is why Christ saves us primarily from original and personal

sin and, as a result, He saves us from the effects and manifestations of sin.

It is fair enough to lay emphasis on "social sin", but sin cannot be reduced to a single "social sin": that would be to forget that "social sin" and its consequences—unjust and oppressive social structures—are the fruits of the wickedness of the human heart; are, as it were, a coalescence of all personal sins. That is why it is useless to change existing social structures, if the heart of man remains unchanged.

One cannot therefore substitute the primacy of this world and history for the true primacy of the full realization of the Kingdom of God in eternity; the primacy of the temporal, therefore, for that of the spiritual. Salvation cannot be reduced to liberation from hunger, from under-development, from political and economic oppression, any more than sin can be reduced to social evil; in substance, capitalism. In such circumstances, one would be left with a "decapitated" Christianity, a Christianity committed to a type of revolutionary political action indistinguishable from Marxism; altogether opposed to its true claim to be inspired by Christ and by the Gospel. Christ's message, under such circumstances, would be transformed into a message of human, earthly liberation, a political ideology, retaining only the name of "religion", the name of "Christian".

Again, with regard to the third characteristic of the new "Christianity"—its false evangelism; the pretension to interpret the Gospel independently of the Church is, in our opinion, an extremely grave matter. Apart from the fact that those who have separated themselves from the communion of the Catholic Church have always made this claim, it must not be forgotten that the Gospel is the Church's own book. Indeed, it originated in the Church. It was the Church which gave it birth. It was entrusted to her by Christ, and she it was who authenticated it and pronounced it worthy of belief. From this it follows that the Church alone possesses the secret of the true interpretation of the Gospel, for she alone is possessed of the Holy Ghost, from Whom the Gospel originated.

The Gospel does not belong to the poor; it belongs to the Church; that is to say, it belongs to the poor in so far as

they form part of that community founded by Christ, which is the Church. But to claim that she uses the Gospel as an ideological manifesto in support of capitalism is nothing short of an ideological Marxist assertion which we can afford to ignore, since Marxism itself derives from an ideological exposition of the nature and life of the Church. Moreover, to read the Gospel "from the point of view of the oppressed" or from a "leftist angle" would surely mean submitting Christ to the judgement of Marx, submitting the Gospel to the outlook expressed in *Das Kapital*. Would this not be to substitute the primacy of politics for the primacy of the Faith?

New Ecclesiology

As for the ecclesiology defended by the new "Christianity", three points should be noted. First and foremost, to identify the Church with the world would be to destroy Her. The Church is in the world, but is not the world. Furthermore, to assert that the Church exists for the world does not mean that she must lose herself in the world and disappear within it. It is one thing to say that she should not seek the riches and power of this world; it is an entirely different thing to say that she should not have her own institutions because, while seeking an authentic inner poverty, it is essential that she be embodied in history and have, in consequence, a visible, institutional structure of her own; her own apostolic and charitable works. In other words, if one states that the official institutional Church of today is in radical opposition to the Gospel; radical to the point where both her hierarchial structure and her life are unfaithful to the Gospel and to the poor, one might just as well state that Christ and the Holy Ghost are no longer with the Church. What reason would there then be for remaining in the Church? Remain in order to save her? What presumption this would be! If Christ is unable to save the Church, who could claim to be able to do so? The only option would be to leave her to her fate and take a different path with Christ and with man; but without the Church, without ecclesiastical structures. Yet one could and should ask oneself whether, without the Church or, rather, by

freely withdrawing from her, one could still remain with Christ and not run the risk of finding oneself alone with man—without Christ and without God.

Concluding Remarks: The New Christianity an Anti-Faith

If this is the new "Christianity", we have cause to ask ourselves whether we have come face to face with a new form of Modernism which, in its efforts to make Christianity more "meaningful" for man today, has emptied it of its true substance. It is certainly true that the new "Christianity" does not deny any of the great Christian Realities — God, Christ, the Church, eternal life, the Kingdom of God, sin, salvation; but while giving nominal acceptance to these fundamental realities, it reinterprets them, and dilutes them to such an extent that little, if anything, remains of their true and authentic Christian meaning.

We are forced to the conclusion that this new "Christianity", as described above, is not only irreconcilable with traditional Christianity, but in radical opposition to it. Some readers may find this too severe a judgement. Their first argument will be that the new "Christians" in spite of their exaggerations and audacious behaviour, are far from wanting to deny the fundamental truths of the Catholic Faith. They will then point out that, in the judgements we have formed above, we have failed to take into account the new theories recently accepted in the field of theology; i.e. we have made no allowance for legitimate theological pluralism.

With regard to the first objection, we must at once make clear that, in our examination of the complex of ideas which we have called the new "Christianity", we were not considering the *intentions* of those who profess these ideas; we were considering solely the *ideas* themselves and their internal logic. It could well be that the new "Christians" have no intention of denying the fundamental truths of the Faith and that they wish to remain in the Church. But that is not the crux of the problem. We are engaged in an objective examination of certain affirmations and the conclusions to which they logically lead. Secondly, it should be noted that an increasing number of those who began by accepting the ideas of the new "Christianity" have ended by rejecting

everything — the Church, the traditional Catholic Faith, institutional religion, in order solely to preserve “faith in Christ” which, for them, was identified with “faith in man”.

With regard to the second objection, it must be pointed out that, in the case of the new “Christianity”, one cannot, it seems to us, speak of theological pluralism. It is not a question here of different theologies; but a question, rather, of different creeds. To speak more clearly; in the new “Christianity”, we are faced with a veritable alteration in the fundamentals of the Catholic Faith. It is not we who are making this very grave accusation; it occurs in the middle of the reply given by the Permanent Council of the French Episcopate to the working document of the International Assembly of “Critical Catholics” held at Lyons on 17th and 18th November, 1973.

It is for this reason that we consider it necessary to warn all those who — prompted no doubt by a genuine love of their fellowmen and of the Gospel — would be tempted to join the new “Christianity”. In doing so, they run the risk of putting themselves outside the Church, outside the authentic Catholic Faith which was given to the Apostles by Christ, and transmitted through the Church. Unfortunately, the temptation of the new “Christianity” appears, outwardly, in terms of fidelity to Christ, to the Gospel and to the “poor”; a fidelity which a Christian can only ignore at the risk of losing his soul. Moreover, it is a temptation which is very difficult to resist. This makes it even more necessary to realize that it is a temptation, a deadly snare to be avoided, by God’s grace, with clarity of mind; by withstanding the relentless pressure of slogans and of fashionable theological and political theories, which are not to be considered correct merely because they happen to be progressive. In the words of the Acts of the Apostles:

“Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock
ravening wolves will enter in among you
men speaking perverse things
to draw away disciples after them”.

Acts 20:28-30.

Though no longer resident in that country, Father Philip Caraman, S.J., who has had considerable experience of pastoral work in Norway, was present when Mother Teresa received her Nobel Peace Prize in Oslo last year. Below he gives his reactions to the occasion.

Mother Teresa in Oslo

PHILIP CARAMAN, S.J.

BEFORE she landed in Oslo Mother Teresa had created a sensation. In spite of pressure put on her by the Nobel Prize Committee, she was adamant that there was to be no banquet in her honour. She would accept an invitation only to tea and biscuits; the cash allotted to the banquet must be given to the poor. After frantic telephone calls to the central Nobel Committee in Stockholm she got her way and the money also, some three thousand pounds which she reckoned would provide food for three hundred people in Calcutta for a year.

It was interesting to get people's reactions. A few of the invited guests thought she had acted ungraciously, but every young Norwegian I spoke to was delighted. "It was splendid", one of them said. "Why waste all that money to be gobbled up in one evening by overfed officials when there are people starving in India"? She had won over the young Norwegians before she had left Calcutta. They had never before shown such enthusiasm for a Nobel Prize winner, at least not since it was given to Martin Luther King.

The Catholic youth organisation of Oslo diocese had started a campaign on her behalf before her nomination was announced. On the day she landed they were in all the main streets selling for her cause prints of a portrait done by one of the leading Norwegian artists. One saw them constantly going back to their headquarters to get fresh supplies.

At the airport she was met by the Bishop of Skopje, her native town, the Prioress of the convent where she was to

stay, the Bishop of Oslo and the entire Norwegian Nobel committee.

At the press conference she answered questions professionally. Within seconds she had given the tone to her whole visit.

"What advice would you give journalists?"

"Be responsible", she told them. "The press can destroy peace. Remember Our Lord's words: 'I am the truth to be told'."

"Why did you accept the Peace Prize?"

"Because people must not be allowed to deny the existence of the poor".

At the risk of appearing ungrateful she added:

"It is not what you give that matters, but the love you put into the gift". She said what she was to repeat later several times in different ways: she was fighting abortion by adoption. Abortion was evil.

An American journalist enquired how people could best help her work and got the surprising answer: "By loving everyone at home. You can't spread love unless it is there".

It was easy to forget that she was addressing the world's press, this small, hunched woman with a dark, dry skin, radiating joy. People outside the press lounge pushed up against the frosted windows to catch a glimpse of her. When a battery of cameras flashed inches from her face she appeared not to notice them.

From the airport she was driven to the Indian Embassy for a reception. It was then about five in the evening. Everyone who received an invitation must have accepted. Over six hundred were there or waiting to get in when I left after half an hour.

A Norwegian reporter noted that she took only water to drink. She had not attended Mass that morning and was going from there to an evening Mass. It was the feast of the Immaculate Conception.

For the next three days she had little breathing space.

On Sunday morning she attended Mass at the Catholic Cathedral and read the bidding prayers she had composed; then there was a meeting with the parishioners, a talk to the Sisters, a conference with her co-workers (they had

come from all countries), a television interview in the afternoon, to which she agreed only after exacting a promise from a director that he would show "no filth or violence on the box".

That Sunday evening it was the turn of the people of Oslo to welcome her. During an ecumenical service in the Lutheran cathedral the crowd who could not find standing room waited in the cold for an hour to greet her when she came out.

With flaming torches they escorted her through the centre of the city to a large parish hall. All joined in, young, old, middle-aged, singing and waving, marching at a brisk pace to keep warm. Eight to ten in a row they formed a path of flame stretching for more than half a mile.

The chief of police who watched the procession said that this was the most peaceful award of a peace prize he had ever known. He contrasted it with last year when the prize was given jointly to Sadat and Begin. Then, as he said, the security measures were more like preparations for war.

A girls' choir sang a welcome inside the hall and gave her a donation which they had collected among themselves. Several other presentations followed. The Dean of the Cathedral announced that the collection taken an hour earlier at the door was an all-time record, nearly five thousand pounds.

In addition a voluntary collection (it was organised by a Catholic from Bergen) taken throughout the country had already produced £38,000 and it was still going on. In all she was given on that evening alone in voluntary contributions a sum amounting to rather more than half the official prize.

The ceremony of presentation of the Prize took place the next day in the University Aula at one o'clock after Mother Teresa had been driven to the palace to meet the King.

The King came to the ceremony with the Crown Prince and Princess and other members of the family, the President of the Storting or Parliament, the Prime Minister and members of the Government and pretty well everyone of note in Norway. When Mother Teresa went up onto the rostrum to make her speech of thanks the first thing she did

was to enquire whether everyone in the aula had a copy of her prayer for peace, then she got them all to recite it with her.

I was in the gallery at the time and only saw the surprise on the faces of the distinguished audience when I watched the ceremony again on television that evening.

Mother Teresa was speaking also to a world-wide audience on Eurovision. Her theme was the joy and privilege of helping those who were "naked of human dignity, who were nobody to nobody, who had never known what it was to be loved".

She spoke without referring to her notes and almost without emotion. She quoted the words of an old man she had picked up off a garbage heap in Calcutta. "I have lived like an animal all my life", he told her. "Now I die like an angel".

She was not afraid to strike a phrase that would long be remembered in Norway. Looking in the direction of the President of the Storting, she said. "The poorest nations in the world are those that legalise abortion". She pleaded for courage to stand by the unborn child and concluded: "A child is God's greatest gift to a family, to a nation, to the world".

Aftenposten, the leading national paper, accused her the next morning of misusing the occasion to preach "anti-quoted Catholic doctrine", but was forced to admit that she was a humble and courageous woman. When she spoke again the next day in the same hall it was full of young people who made it clear to her how much she had won their affection and enthusiasm.

AN APPEAL

not for money, but for prayer. If you are willing to offer a Rosary (five decades) each day for our Holy Father, please send your name and address to the Rev. J. Brown, Abbey Mead, Hall Lane, Lydiate, Liverpool L31 4HR.

It would be a comfort to the Pope to know that every day his children are speaking to Our Lady on his behalf.

Not only will all who had the privilege of knowing John Bradburne be delighted with this article by his life-long friend, Father John Dove, S.J. All who read it will recognise in its subject not only a near-saint, but, like his Master, a sign of contradiction; at base, the only answer to the pagan materialism of our times. I had the privilege of knowing John Bradburne. I could not possibly forget him, even if I were foolish enough to try and do so; which, please God, I shall never be.

John Randal Bradburne 1921 - 1979 A Spiritual Evaluation

JOHN DOVE, S.J.

JOHN Randall Bradburne, born of a noble family, son of an Anglican Minister—martyred in Zimbabwe Rhodesia, on 5th September 1979.

John Bradburne was a dear friend and helper of the Society of Jesus in Zimbabwe Rhodesia. He was much loved by all who worked on the Missions—Jesuits, Franciscans, Redemptorists; “Blue” L.C.M. Sisters (who cared for him down the years); Dominican Sisters, African L.C.B.L. Sisters and many layfolk who knew and loved him too. Archbishop Patrick Chakaipa endorsed his vocation to the destitute poor and entrusted John with the care of the Leper Chapel, allowing him to give them Holy Communion daily. It was, in fact, Archbishop Markall who had first appointed John as caretaker of the leper chapel with authority to distribute Holy Communion to his little flock.

John was a prophet, a sign for the 20th Century Consumer Society, this technological age, an era of materialism and disbelief. He was quite naturally supernatural with a

gaiety and wit which enchanted all. He was a mystic, poet, and music-maker all in one. He had easy converse with God both in his quiet, solitary prayer and through his poetry and music. He was almost a one book man—Holy Scripture, the womb of the Holy Spirit. He did however lean on another book too—*The Cloud of Unknowing*. He loved *The Cloud* and longed to pierce the veil that stood between him and the sight of God. Often he used to say “Roll on the Kingdom”.

Layman

We must here remember that John was a layman, member of the Third Order of St. Francis and voluntary Missionary. He obeyed the rule of the Third Order singing, for the post part in Latin, The Little Office of Our Lady, daily. He also kept to the hours as much as possible, rising at dawn for Matins and ending the day with Vespers and Compline with his beloved lepers. He was also a man for the rosary. For the rest, he kept up a constant rhythm of prayer. He loved the Jesus Prayer of “The Way of the Pilgrim” given to him by Fr. Michael Ivens, S.J. He adapted it for the needs of Zimbabwe. In later years John was awarded and finally buried in the Franciscan habit—a rare honour for a layman.

His Life

His father was an Anglican Minister with a living, first in Cumberland where John was born, and then in Norfolk. After a normal schooling, the war caught up with John's life. He went straight to the Army instead of to University. In 1940, John found himself with a Commission in the 9th Gurkha Rifles and was soon in Malaya with the 2/9th Gurkhas. The Japanese invaded Malaya, Singapore fell, and John and his men were told to pair off and to avoid capture. He spent a whole month in the Malayan Jungle, living off roots and a little fruit—village rice when he could get it. He and another Gurkha Officer captured a sanpan and attempted to sail across to Sumatra. They were shipwrecked and washed ashore in true Pauline style. Some days later they made a second attempt with some “Jocks” from a Highland division. This time they made it, and the last British Destroyer to leave Sumatra took John to safety.

It was at this time that I met John back at our Gurkha Regimental Centre in Dehra Dun amid the lovely foothills of the Himalayas. I had a gramophone record—light music. John took one look at it, made as though to throw it out the window and put on Johann Sebastian Bach's "Jesu Joy of Man's Desiring"! Bach was the tops for John—he had made it—his music reached the celestial heights, always to the praise of God. Thus our friendship began. It was March, 1942.

John's spiritual development was in four main phases: the Seeker, the Pilgrim, the Solitary, the Martyr.

Search for God

Soon he was to be back in the thick of war again. This time "Broadway" in Burma. General Wingate inspected the men of John's brigade before they "crashed" into Burma in gliders. Wingate singled out John on parade, shook him by the hand and congratulated him on his escape and his M.C. The World does not give M.C.'s to the likes of John—it was conveniently overlooked.

In Burma, a fellow officer said that John in the thick of battle was mostly bird watching, singing psalms, and attending to the wounded. He had incredible courage but no taste for the weapons of war. Gradually, his search for God led him to enquire about Monasticism and the Catholic Faith. The war ended and John found Buckfast Abbey to be near to the place of his Father's retirement in Devon. Buckfast welcomed him and Dom Raphael Stones, O.S.B. took him in and gave him a job in the monastery garden and cemetery whilst he prepared him for his reception into the Catholic Church, which took place on the feast of Christ the King, 1947. John's real goal was the Carthusians—they were solitaries and so was he. They sang the praises of God too—a great vocation! John went to Parkminster to the Charterhouse in Sussex. He stayed as a working layman for four months at the Monastery, acting as door keeper. The Prior finally advised him to go to Rome and to pray at the feet of St. Peter for guidance. Maybe he was too much of the poet, maybe he had invisible war wounds? At any rate the Carthusians set him upon Stage II of his life.

The Pilgrim

He had a ticket to Rome, where Peter indicated Jerusalem! The other pilgrims were quite enchanted by John and so they passed the hat around to help him on his journey. He reached Cyprus with their alms and there at Famagusta met a merchant, Third Order of St. Francis, who took him in. A week later, he was in an open grain boat chugging its way to Haifa. John had a gladstone bag, a recorder, a picture of Our Lady and a spare shirt. He walked from Haifa to Jerusalem.

Young Israel, liberating themselves from the British, thought he was a British spy. John had to spend a night in a Military Prison but soon dispelled their suspicions—he was set free. Then Nazareth and Jerusalem his goal. There he asked his way to the Benedictines on Mount Sion. He was mis-directed to a little Order by the name of “Our Lady of Mount Sion” especially founded for the conversion of the Jews. John loved the Jews since he loved all oppressed people. The Jews fell into this category at this time with memories of Belsen and the Nazi atrocities fresh in the mind.

John just loved signs from God. He took it as a God given sign that he should enter this little Order. They sent him to their Novitiate in Louvain, Belgium. He was there over a year when a very discerning Novice Matser said, “John you are not for us, you are either a Pere de Foucauld (a desert hermit) or a Benedict Joseph Labre—the Pilgrim Saint. Go back to Rome and pray again”.

John the pilgrim was on the road again. He walked and begged from Louvain to Rome. St. Peter indicated Jerusalem once more but, alas, no boat, no alms.

John made his way up into the Appenine foothills at the back of Naples and was taken in by a kindly Priest in a mountain village. His room was to be the organ loft of the small Church. He wrote poems and letters using the fixed wooden seat as a table. Here he stayed for a whole year until his father died.

The Solitary

After laying his father to rest in Ottery-St.-Mary, Devon, John tried to live as a hermit on the fringe of Dartmoor

but no raven fed him. Maybe he should try a Monastic Order again? He went to Prinknash, the Benedictine Monastery overlooking Gloucester Abbey. The Monks were then in a country house whilst building a new Abbey. It was too crowded and herd-like for John the Solitary. He left and drifted to London playing madrigals on his recorder as he went. A short sojourn with Burns Oates enabled him to discover Westminster Cathedral. The Choir enthralled him. Could he join it? He signed on as a Sacristan—5th Sacristan as he called it, in the hopes that he might be able one day to lend his voice to the praises of God. What happened? He bumped into Cardinal Godfrey! The Cardinal at once took a liking to John and asked if he would become caretaker of his Elizabethan Country Home—Hare Street House, near Cambridge. Oh yes, he could live in solitude; he only had to caretake. John was in bliss living in Robert Hugh Benson's Study with two harmoniums. He served the Cardinal's Mass upon his rare visits to Hare Street, sang, and wrote poems to God and Our Lady.

Four years of solitude and then? Renovation of this lovely Elizabethan Manor was begun. Removal of oak doors, one Elizabethan chimney, oak panels—this was all too much for John. Builders, noise, architects, chaos. It was then that John wrote to me to enquire if there was a vacant cave in Africa.

Africa 1962: Missionary and Solitary

The Franciscans were generous enough to pay his way out. He helped at Wedza and Gandachibvuva but there were difficulties. John was really a solitary not a mission helper in a technical sense. In 1963, Lord and Lady Acton gave their home at Mbebi, Mazoe, to the Society. It needed a caretaker: Fr. Corrigan, then Mission Superior, invited John to be just that. Solitude, a fine Church with two owls on the rafters above the High Altar; excellent! John was there a year.

In December 1964 an extraordinary event took place. The Jesuit Novices vacated their lovely Novitiate, Silveira House, and moved to Mbebi, Mazoe. John moved to an empty Silveira House to help his life-long friend (John

Dove, S.J.) begin a Centre — a centre for leadership and development. It was still empty, so John found solitude again. He proved to be an excellent caretaker since he never went out. He was always there and he always backed the Centre with his prayer and song. Soon he knew all the wild life,— birds, especially eagles and bees, along with flowering shrubs, trees, rock heights and solitary recesses. It was a joy at night to watch his diligence — every door locked, every tap turned off, the Lord praised with sung compline. In his simple way he prayed for an eagle. Soon an eagle was acquired. Next a prayer for bees and a swarm settled in his room. For John the small was beautiful: All of nature spoke to him of God. Even the Mission cat used to follow him on walks.

Silveira House Centre grew fortified by John's prayer. This meant an institution, courses, people, noise. John moved to the hen house! In 1968 he decided upon Jerusalem once more. He went to visit his mother and then amid a herd of goats he sailed for his beloved Holy Land.

Jerusalem and the wailing wall—all indicated that Africa was his call. John hoped to sail down the East Coast of Africa in an Arab Dhow but the Arab-Israeli war put an end to such a dream voyage. Helped by his brother Philip, from Tripoli he returned to Silveira once again.

God is not outdone in generosity. At this time, 1969, Mtemwa Leper Camp loomed up as one of the horrors of the locality. Some ninety old lepers living in a derelict camp with minimal care by social welfare, were dying of old age, neglect, and spiritual desolation. The local Magistrate's wife approached the Missions. Fr. Edward Ennis, S.J., Mission Superior at the time, volunteered to help and soon a small committee was formed. They invited John to become Warden of Mtemwa Leper Colony. John went out with Fr. Ennis to see the camp. He came back in deep depression—a valley of dark depression, he said.

He went to Mtemwa with a great generosity. Solitude was at stake; book keeping and administration were involved, worse—to have orderlies under him; this was the last straw! John settled in and to his great joy, the little Committee invited Dr. Luisa Guidotti (shot on 6th July

1979 inadvertently by Guard Force), Sister Maria and postulant Elizabeth Tarira, to give medical aid to the poor lepers. Two years of bliss for the lepers. John and Luisa lifted them up from squalor and neglect to care and love. John asked his great friend Arthur Law to design a little rondavel chapel. It was built; even a harmonium was acquired. The lepers became people overnight and rejoiced in being children of God, with the prospect of becoming "that which has not yet been revealed".

This additional care cost money. Fr. Ennis was 'eased off' the Committee. New humanist faces appeared. John was over-issuing on the rations: (lepers received an allowance of about £4.50 per leper per month for food); Luisa was over-spending on non-leprosy drugs and "unnecessary" travel—so they said. John had open confrontation with this new-look Committee. He blew up and they sacked him. First he pitched a borrowed tent on Chigona, the rock feature overlooking the camp. The lepers insisted he came down—there was a leopard up there at night. Some kindly white farmers built him a pre-fab tin hut just outside the wire of the leper compound. It was a hot house, full of mosquitoes with no water and no sanitation, but the accoustics were good for John's sung office!

Preparation for Martyrdom

St. Francis Xavier remarked that there was no greater suffering than to witness what one had built up for God, being smashed down by man. The lepers sank back into neglect. They had impersonal care from impersonal social and medical welfare. An attempt had even been made to put numbers round their necks. John watched and suffered. He crept in at nights to keep night vigil with the dying, reading from a Shona Bible by the light of a flickering hut fire. He dug their graves. He consoled them with daily Communion. John the reject by the World, continued God's work unknown and unseen by night.

This "little" martyrdom lasted until near the end. Alistair Guthrie alleviated his sufferings somewhat by getting on to the leper Committee. Good Catholic, holy man Alistair did all he could to get John re-instated as Warden. (He too died last year of cancer with John at his side). At last

John was allowed to enter the compound in the day. Blind Peter was bathed again by John; Veronica given relief for malaria; Moses helped to find his way from hut to toilet. Open wounds were bandaged; bruised hearts consoled. The smouldering flax flickered a little again. Was it to be a second Spring?

The fires of spiritual darkness continued to build up the martyr unbeknown to John.

"It is band enough having leprosy without having me", he used to say; "Jolly decent of the lepers to have me". He wanted to contract leprosy to identify with them wholly; only the fear of being segregated to a white leprosarium forced him to take some care. Added to his ordinary sufferings was an increasing sense of being useless—of being thought "mad" into the bargain.

But the prophet in him became more pronounced. "Stand up and tell them all I command you. Do not be dismayed at their presence I for my part will make you into a fortified city, a pillar of iron, a wall of bronze, to comfort this land" (Jer. 1). "This land"—the leper camp was comforted. All who did it ill met the righteous anger of John. He made enemies of White and Black alike. Anyone who offended his lepers came in for it! Soldiers pinching mangoes, herdboys allowing cattle to eat leper maize, orderlies cutting trees which gave shade and beauty, or grass which provided a cushion for those without legs. The Warden who "replaced" John came in for the worst of John's prophetic rebuke.

The war crept on and around Mtoko's, Mtemwa. Pauline Hutchings (wife of a white farmer) still came to bring John his meagre diet and to cheer him. Brave Pauline. Fr. David Gibbs, prevented from going out to his Mass Centres, came every week to say Mass for John and the lepers. David also comforted John in so many ways. Fewer visitors could get out to Mtemwa. Dr. Luisa still came when she could, bringing him delicacies to coax him to eat, plus drugs for the lepers. Suddenly John fell ill. Luisa brought him in to Salisbury. She put him under the loving care of Professor Gelfand and "the Blues" of St. Anne's Hospital. In late August 1978 he nearly died of this polio type virus. Maybe a forewarning of things to come? John recovered and went

back to Mtemwa after a period of convalescence at Silveira House. Mtemwa leper colony was now more and more isolated due to the war. Guerrillas attacked the reservoir close to John. He often heard gunfire and land-mine explosions. New birds appeared over Mtemwa Mount — helicopters.

The Mujibhas (guerrilla auxiliaries) killed an old man who used to come to Mass at the leper camp. They said that he was a sell-out probably because he was once in the BSAP Police. John was furious. Luisa was frightened lest John's fury be known. She tried to tell John to be less outspoken. The sands of time ebbed out. John now alone in his poverty in his hut, in the middle of a dangerous war zone, was being prepared for the end—his glory. "Gosh, I'm no martyr", he would say,—“not for me”; “What shall I do if they (the guerrillas) come?” “Shall I give them money? No, it is leper money. I will give them coffee”!

It was about 10 or 11 p.m. on Monday 3rd September. No one knows who they were. Some say Mujibha, some say guerrillas, some say enemies. They took John in his underpants and bare feet. He was marched 15 miles into the mountains, probably to await a “Peoples Court”. He was captive until Wednesday 5th September. Near to dawn they shot him. His body was thrown by the roadside with a crude note pinned to it in Shona.

John was dead — his trial over, his final life-speech ended. Gone through the ‘Cloud’ to God.

“Alas the glory of Israel has been slain on your heights.
O Mountains of Gilboa let there be no dew or rain on you
O Jonathan in your death I am stricken”

(2 Sam 1: David's lament over Jonathan and Saul).

Gradually the jig-saw of John's life came together in the crowning glory of his death. Prophet, poet, mystic, music maker, gone home to God. The moulding of the martyr in the crucible of life's demands — demands by God, now complete. “It is finished”—the lion of Mtemwa hath fought the fight and hath prevailed.

May God be praised for John—his love, his truth, his justice, his example, his endurance to the end.

This article by a well-known American Catholic journalist describes a situation in the United States that has its parallel here in this country. One hopes, vainly, I fear, that the Bishops will do something about it—the more so in view of the fact that the Holy Father has made his mind on the matter perfectly clear. Acknowledgements to the *Wanderer*.

Liturgy: the need for Order

FRANK MORRIS

MORE than one eyewitness has told me that the Pope, distributing Communion in Des Moines, would not put the Host in held-out hands, but waited for the communicant to open his or her mouth. These are completely reliable witnesses.

The fact is not insignificant. At the least it establishes the personal preference of the Holy Father for the way Communion should be received, just as his predecessor Pope Paul VI indicated his preference by forbidding "Communion in the hand" to be given in St. Peter's Basilica.

What happened in Des Moines at least lends support to my opinion, expressed previously, that Communion on the tongue remains the ordinary way of receiving, with the giving in the hand being toleration of a supposed "custom". It was approval by Rome of a non-existent custom that led me in the past to question the manner in which the permission was obtained. Rome undoubtedly was led to believe such custom was present. The Pope obviously did not feel compelled to honor the "custom".

Like many permissions, this one has been seized upon to promote the new method of distributing Communion. Many Catholic Americans I am sure feel the Church has changed its usual method of giving Communion and finds

the new way preferable. The Pope's actions have, at the least, refuted any such idea. How much of the catechesis before the advent of this "custom" stressed how superior it was, how much more in keeping with the nature of the Sacrament? If this were correct, why then the Pope's action in declining to follow it?

Eyewitnesses also report shock at the manner in which some priests were distributing the Host. One saw the Hosts being distributed wholesale from what appeared to be a coffee can. Several Hosts would be given to various communicants to pass out as they chose. One husband asked for a Host to give his wife, and received it. The witnesses saw pieces being dropped upon the ground.

Admittedly the situation must have made such manner of distribution convenient. But can we let convenience govern in matters so sensitive and sacred? Certainly ways were found to distribute Communion in a dignified manner with all receiving on the tongue in the great convocations and Eucharistic Congresses of the past. Of course, it takes planning, discipline, etc. But why do we no longer feel such planning and discipline are necessary?

Then we have the pique being shown by some (for example columnist Dolores Curran who says she turned down an invitation to receive Communion from the Pope) because extraordinary ministers of Communion were not utilized at the Pope's Mass. The supposition obviously is that there is a "right" for lay persons to give out Communion. It is clear, both from Vatican permission and Vatican II that such is not the case. Laity are appointed by the Hierarchy to certain ecclesiastical ministries; they supply certain ministerial needs. Nowhere is it put on the basis of "right". Nowhere is it called necessary for the fulfilment of lay persons or to reflect their dignity. Something has gone radically wrong with the understanding of these persons disturbed by what they consider an insult to their dignity. Should anyone be insulted when a gratuitous privilege is withheld?

The Bishops were called by the Pope to greater diligence in the role of guardianship. Certainly that role embraces the liturgy. That is one place their conscientious answer to the Pope's call can be immediately made.

This is Father Crane's third and final article of reflections on Professor James Hitchcock's recently published, *Catholicism and Modernity* (obtainable from St. Duthac's Book Service, 29 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey, England at £5.95, post-free). In this article, Father Crane considers the relationship between the rootless secularism of the contemporary Progressive Establishment within the Church and the craving of that Establishment for constant confrontation and on-going change.

CURRENT COMMENT

Secularist Revolt within the Church

THE EDITOR

BY definition, the autonomous Christian (again, pardon the contradiction) is one who would find fulfilment in disregard not merely of his Christian, but of his human essence, which is found in his total dependence on God. Pledged to human fulfilment, which can only be found in God, he is pledged, by reason of his chosen autonomy, to seek it apart from God. The result can only be frustration. His reaction; by no means necessarily a return to his roots in God. His chosen self-containment forbids it. More likely, a further sally into fresh secularist adventures in aid of fulfilment. Again, frustration. Again, a further sally. The process tends to become an end in itself. Religion, for such, is reduced to the on-going thrill of perpetually new, yet rootless experience.

Rootlessness and Reassurance

There are, of course, degrees of rootlessness. It is important not to overstate the case which Professor Hitchcock makes so well and with such clarity in his book. In previ-

ous articles I have pointed out what needs to be kept constantly in mind, that the origins of the present crisis within the Church are to be found in a drift away from the supernatural and into the secular or worldly, as we used to call it, on the part, not primarily of the laity, but of a sizeable segment of priests and religious within the Church. It is they who have set the pace, perversely interpreting the Council's call for renewal as release from that restraint, which the supernatural demands of them, into secularized normalcy; its vision of a Church open to the world as one in which Christians should accommodate themselves to worldly values. Thereby the way was cleared for the rootless cleric or religious to do his own thing, which he identified at best with God's thing; at worst, without any attempt at such identification: in either case, in disregard of the teaching authority of the Church, except when it appeared or could be made to appear as coinciding with his own desires.

Reassurance Through Constant Experimentation

The autonomous cleric or religious, out of touch — too often out of love—with the transcendent, seeking his own fulfilment without reference to God and the supernatural, in disregard of Church Authority, is, of necessity, a lonely person because self-contained within himself; despite himself, therefore, in constant need of reassurance. He finds this in a number of ways. Constant experimentation is one. The thrill that comes with the daring of the new thing brings temporary confidence and, with it, a recapturing for the moment of lost identity that went when he lost his roots in God. Parishioners who have suffered so much at the hands of local proponents of new, personalized liturgical forms will know exactly what I mean. They are never left alone. I am *not* talking here about the new liturgy itself; but of the type of experimentation that is still practised on it so often at parish level throughout the Church; in so many cases without any reference to the feelings of the parishioners themselves. One thinks, for example, of the way in which, in this country, Communion in the hand was first *allowed* at top level, then *enforced*, without warrant, at local level, in all sorts of devious ways and without

a trace of compassion; as, for example, when communion rails were bashed down so that communicants were forced to stand, which made it easier for the on-going cleric to force the host into unwilling hands.

Other examples could be quoted within this context. They point to the sorry fact that what the progressive, autonomous priest or religious has in mind so often with his experimentation is *not* primarily the good of his congregation or group or class of students or whatever it may be, but, simply, the reassurance in his self-contained loneliness that comes from the thrill of breaking new ground, the temporary recapturing of lost identity that goes with it. Neither need this be confined to the parish or chaplaincy or whatever. One thinks of the seminary professor, conferencier or retreat-giver, who proposes new and "daring" doctrine to his audience of seminarians or nuns or charming teenagers and is rewarded with their enraptured attention, primarily because so much that he says carries so much human appeal; the inclination being always to endorse what they do, to canonise what is rather than to say what should be. Thus the word goes round. He is passed from group to group. Wherever he goes they come to hear him. Here is reassurance indeed; the devotion of the many he is misleading in their naivete and who will go with him the whole way—even if it leads now to confrontation with, as distinct from his previous disregard of, Church Authority. As I write these lines, I am thinking of Hans Kung and the mass of students at Tübingen who packed his lecture hall to overflowing and applauded him wildly after the news that Rome — so properly and at long last — had censured him severely. Thank God Rome did it; but let no one thing Rome's censure robbed Kung of his assurance. It gave him, however unwittingly, the further reassurance he needed. The very loneliness of his position in defiance of the Pope brings him the following he needs and, with it, the reassurance to sustain him in his chosen self-containment.

Self-Assertion and the Peer Group

And the following is not only that of his students and many, perhaps, of his professional associates at Tübingen. It stretches wider than that. I am thinking of the peer

group of which he is a member; those theologians within the Church who have set themselves up as a kind of parallel teaching authority within it, claiming the right to teach what they will, as and when they will, often in defiance of the Church's *Magisterium*, and always in the name of "academic freedom". The quest for that, of course, began in the Garden of Eden. The result has not been happy. What autonomous man always forgets — as Adam forgot and Luther forgot and Rousseau forgot and the Modernists of yesterday and today have forgotten — is that man by virtue of his creation out of nothing by God is totally dependent on Him; free, indeed to choose, but obliged to set his choosing within the context of God's truth, which it is man's duty to receive, not make; for the simple reason that man is not God. It is precisely this that the autonomous Christian — theologian or otherwise — cannot see clearly because of his chosen autonomy, which sets his thinking, by definition, in disregard of God's truth and the teaching authority of the Church whose duty it is to uphold it. Having made himself the measure of all things, he cannot, again by definition, allow any measure to God. "Academic freedom" emerges as no more than a cover-up in contradiction of his true essence, which is found in his total dependence on God.

Small wonder, then, that those within the Church so covered, asserting themselves in defiance of its authority in order to find and fulfil themselves, find reassurance not only in the act of self-assertion itself, but in the brittle strength that comes to them from the popularity gained, thereby, amongst their peers—their like-minded associates in the post-conciliar, parallel magisterium of our time who, in their turn, are encouraged by the example of men like Kung, to further self-assertion through defiance of the teaching authority of the Church. To retreat in face of it would be to lose face, damaging their self-esteem beyond words. Their only course, as they see it, is to stand their ground and defy the Pope—and with him God's truth—until the point is reached where either they or he must give. One thing we know and this is that it will not be he. "*Qui mange du Pape s'en meurt*". History leaves us in no doubt on that score.

All of which makes one wonder whether the pace and fury attendant on so much post-conciliar reform within the Church today may not be attributed very largely to the need for reassurance felt by autonomous priests and religious who handle it at national and local level. I think there is a good deal in this thought. It tends to be confirmed by the fact that the reform has taken on, to so large an extent, a desecralised context. From the beginning, there was little of holiness in it. It was and still is bereft of compassion. Its instigators at local level—priests and nuns and attendant progressive laity—struck one from the beginning, as they still strike one, as self-contained in what appears as their chosen secularity. What they were after, as it appeared, was power. Their ideas were of themselves, out of tune with the supernatural, vicious, very often, in their attitude to old and well-tried devotions, arrogant and self-centered. In reality, very lonely in their self-containment, no longer anchored in God, seeking identity in the power that appeared to be theirs, particularly at diocesan and parish level, to mould the Church anew in the image of what I can only call their earthbound selves.

These are the types, I fear, who will attempt to dominate the proceedings of the National Pastoral Council shortly to be thrust upon us. It will be, very probably, their last major attempt at self-assertion, now that Pope John Paul has made it very clear that authority is going to be restored to the Church. Those who have defied that authority or disregarded it for so long in one way or another — the dissident theologians, priests and religious and their lay hangers-on who staff the new bureaucracies within the Church—are already beginning to run for cover. Either that or they will have to try vainly to confront fearless papal authority, speaking on behalf of millions of Catholics, that will no longer tolerate their double-speak; that will confront them, in consequence, with the choice of submitting to itself or getting out of the Church.

The Strength of Pope John Paul

It needs to be noticed at this point that the autonomous clerics and religious responsible for what appears to me more and more clearly as a post-conciliar revolt against the

supernatural, masquerading under the guise of reform and twisting conciliar decrees to suit its basically secularist purpose; that these autonomous reformers would never have got as far as they did had authority not shown itself so weak in face of their assault. There can, I am afraid, be no doubt of the weakness—from Pope Paul VI, himself, and those who surrounded him, down to the bishops at diocesan level and their parish priests. What we had in fact was something very close to what the great Cardinal Newman described as a “collapse of the *magisterium*” or teaching authority of the Church in face of a clever and cruel secularist attack from within the Church itself on everything that Catholics held dear. The hope, perhaps, was that, if concessions were made, the assault would cease. The miscalculation was enormous, for the autonomous appetite grows by what it feeds on. The more you give it, the more it will take. No one knows this better than Pope John Paul. This is why, after only a year and a little more in office, he has put his foot down. As yet, the Bishops do not appear to have done so. I confess to considerable disappointment that, so far as I know, no letter from a single member of the Hierarchy of England and Wales has, at the time of writing this piece (3/1/80), appeared in the correspondence published in the *Times* concerning the censuring of Hans Kung. I would have thought that the Bishops would have been amongst the first to offer the Holy Father publicly their total and unswerving support in defence of his action which is not only right in itself, but has the support of all but the tiniest minority that makes up the Progressive Catholic Establishment in this country. Instead, not a word. Is it permitted to ask why? The more so, perhaps, in view of the fact that such a gesture at such a time would have given fresh heart to so many Catholics who have suffered so much these past years as they have witnessed so helplessly the inroads into the Faith they love made with such arrogance by the Progressive Establishment in this country.

The Triumph of the Therapeutic

Let me return for a moment to the loneliness endemic in the self-containment of the autonomous Christian which leads him to seek reassurance and, with it, fulfilment in the

experiential thrill of on-going change, in the sense of power that comes to him as clerical bureaucrat, as theologian or as inaugurator of that change and pace-setter within it; in the publicity and applause this wins for him, not only from his peer group—the Progressive Establishment of which he is a member—but from the wider secular society within which, in the West certainly, the contemporary Church is set. This society bears witness to what Professor Hitchcock, following the Freudian sociologist, Philip Rieff, calls “the triumph of the therapeutic” (or, as others would probably call it, “permissive”). Hitchcock proceeds on page 35 of his admirable book :

“Rieff perceives a fundamental shift from the ‘inhibitory’ to the ‘remissive’ mode of behaviour, from a culture whose dominant symbols convey moral and religious affirmations, which include interdicts or prohibitions, to a culture which systematically grants permission to the individual to transgress these interdicts in the name of personal freedom and fulfilment. The act of transgression becomes ‘endlessly attractive’ and a reflex attitude develops in which no fixed moral or religious belief enjoys authority or commands obedience for any appreciable length of time.

“The result is the emergence of a ‘culture of indifference’ which uses the rhetoric of faith and commitment to undermine both and even to establish a counter-faith, ‘a secular vision of comforts that renders all salvations obsolete’ . . .”

I pause for a moment to point out that this must be so. The commitment of self-contained, autonomous man to his own fulfilment as primary leads him necessarily to brook no interference from outside, from whatever quarter it may come, divine or human, supernatural or secular. This explains, of course, his rejection of personal sin and his concentration on that form of sin which he mistakenly calls social, his rejection of Church Authority and his increasing inclination to reject Christ as divine and possessed in consequence of the power to lay on autonomous man those commands from outside that are foreign to his concept of freedom from restraint as a condition essential to the achievement of his secularist ideal of self-contained fulfil-

ment. Of necessity, this secularist ideal, presented, as it is today, as a new "faith", is subversive of all transcendental doctrine and Faith. What one can only describe as its insidious devilry lies there. It is essential, really, that, at this particular juncture, we grasp this point, which is basic to an understanding of the seriousness of the present position within the Church. As Hitchcock continues on the same page:

"Although modern Christianity has made strenuous efforts to accommodate itself to the ethics of the therapeutic, defined as a 'manipulative sense of well-being', the most fundamental assumptions of the historic Judaeo-Christian religion are in fact undermined by this new cult".

Hitchcock goes on to cite Rieff:

"Religious man was born to be saved; psychological man was born to be pleased. The difference was established long ago when 'I believe', the cry of the ascetic, lost precedence to 'one feels', the cry of the therapeutic".

Hitchcock continues in his own words:

"The fact that the nature of this revolution has been so little understood makes its influence within the Church all the more lethal, since many Catholics have adopted the therapeutic mentality without even realizing it; little in their education and in the traditional Catholic mode of thinking prepared them for it. Trained to be on guard against overt heresies, they had little sensitivity to ideas that were not recognizably heretical and in fact seemed to have nothing to do with the explicit doctrines of Christianity. Yet in the post-conciliar Church it is the spread of the therapeutic mentality, as Rieff defines it, which is at the root of most other problems".

Rootless Change and the Therapeutic Mentality

In amplification of the above and of the ramifications of the therapeutic mentality within the Church, Hitchcock proceeds on page 58:

"The primacy of the therapeutic attitude—the granting of sovereign authority to a self which is intolerant of all limitations imposed from the outside—should not

be understood only in moral terms, still less only in terms of sexual morality (although it is most dramatically manifest there). The governing spirit of much of what has called itself renewal (within the Church) in the past fifteen years has been essentially negative and, in a quite literal sense, reactionary. The positive meaning of liturgical reform, the renewal of religious life, ecumenism, and many other things have been lost in the midst of an attitude of mind which focuses solely on the conditions of its own self-defined liberation. *Aggiornamento* has, in the minds of many people, taken on meaning exclusively in terms of a proclaimed freedom from the past—we do not need to fast any more, wear uncomfortable and conspicuous ‘sacred’ clothing, pray at set times, follow a ritual not devised by ourselves, believe particular doctrines, submit to particular moral laws, follow the injunctions of our pastors.

“Renewal has been interpreted in the liberal West largely in terms of a deeply culturally conditioned emphasis on ‘freedom’ . . .

“The fact that the promised renewal has proved disappointing to many people is directly traceable to certain weaknesses inherent in modern liberalism—its far greater capacity for criticizing received beliefs than for discovering new wisdom and its tendency to make freedom the end of existence, a purely empty concept which is unable to suggest how such freedom may be meaningfully used. In the Catholic Church this has led to several quite predictable states of mind, now dominant among the most articulate people in the Church. ‘Renewal’ is largely equated with the winning of constant victories over the ‘rigidities’ of the past, continually opening new territories formerly deemed taboo . . .

“The Second Vatican Council was, on the superficial level, a dramatic event which stimulated in many Catholics a sense of awakening from a long torpor, paralleling the political awakening from the Eisenhower years that was personified by America’s first Catholic president. But since the deeper meaning of the Council could not be assimilated nearly so readily, the expecta-

tion of renewal has remained largely on the level of excitement and that almost narcotic need for outside stimulation which Rieff diagnosed for the culture at large. It cannot be overemphasized that in the present milieu an enthusiastic welcoming of constant change, or at the very least a prudent 'openness' to all possibilities, is the only security. Those who have coped most successfully have been those who have exorcised from themselves the ability to be shocked or anxious. The popularity of what is called process theology derives largely from the assurance it offers modern Christians that change is, after all, the only reality that need be taken seriously, an assurance that their culture constantly drums into them in uncountable numbers of ways.

"The Roman Catholic Church in the West is now decadent, in that it has lost its sense of self-generated energy and purpose, as have many of its members. The years of heady excitement have been followed either by disillusionment or a troubled boredom, a sense of treading water, of waiting for new developments which for some reason fail to appear. There is an almost insatiable need for artificial stimulus, some force which will once again get the Church 'moving', although where it should be moving and why are unclear. Many Catholics have 'liberated' themselves into the wild blue yonder, beyond the reach of gravity, and for them further changes in the Church—which they crave compulsively—are like astronauts doing acrobatics in outer space. There is nothing substantial at stake.

"In this context a constantly sustained illusion of movement is essential, and the Church has been deeply affected by the modern mentality which repeatedly and without embarrassment announces new 'break-throughs', most of them forgotten in a few years. A succession of fads in theology, spirituality, social action, education, group dynamics, and personal therapy comes and goes, each quickly used and used up, as devotees wait impatiently for the next wave. Much has been made of the Second Vatican Council's image of the 'pilgrim Church', without analyzing what it means to

be a pilgrim—to have a fixed and known goal, to be single-minded in quest of it, to place oneself wholly in the hands of God, to submit to a rigorous discipline which alone will make attainment of the goal possible.

“In this atmosphere everything which is stable, ordinary and traditional is a standing rebuke, to be ignored or discredited . . .

“The largely negative thrust of so much of what has passed for renewal, its focusing on those things in the traditional Church deemed unhealthy or outmoded, has created a situation in which many Catholics are maximally susceptible to fads of all kinds. Since they no longer possess deeply held convictions of their own, they are incapable of criticizing such fads. Superficially the ‘liberals’ in the Church appear to be affirmative in their judgments, while ‘conservatives’ are in the position of critics and carpers. But conservatives are merely seeking to defend long-held beliefs which have come under severe attack in recent years, and are therefore profoundly ‘positive’ in their ultimate commitments.

“Self-consciously modern Catholics appear to have a compulsive need to think of themselves as ‘creative’, ‘open’, and ‘free’, the authenticity of these claims constantly tested by their ability to respond affirmatively to every new development . . .

“Like most apostles of change, avant-garde Catholics oscillate between proclamations of a radically transformed world which will scarcely resemble anything known in the past and condescending assurances that nothing essential has changed and that traditionalists are merely neurotically insecure. Increasingly, however, changes are not justified primarily in terms of the good or bad they promise, which are measurable according to some agreed-upon standard, but merely in terms of the desirability of change itself . . .”

Ramifications

An incredibly long quotation; but, to my way of thinking, abundantly justified because of the brilliance of the analysis contained within it. Those looking for what might be called the psycho/spiritual roots of the present trouble within the Church will find them here. I can only hope that a reading

of this long quotation from Professor Hitchcock's book will induce many to buy the book itself. I thought a great deal of it, amongst other things because it seemed to me to confirm an analysis of present troubles within the Church that had been simmering in my mind for a long time. What it comes to is this—for the autonomous Christian (the key lies in the lapse of a sizeable minority of priests and religious into self-contained and necessarily secularist autonomy), renewal adds up to no more and no less than a purely negative thing; release from restraint, which means release into one's self-contained and, therefore, necessarily desupernaturalised self; from which relief is sought ultimately in self-assertion within the peer group of others so minded—the contemporary Progressive Establishment within the Church whose supposedly reforming effort serves only as a cover for what is, in reality on the part of its participants, consciously or subconsciously, not a true reform, but a secularist revolt against the supernatural. Inevitably, this Progressive Establishment is at home in the therapeutic or permissive, secularist society of the contemporary West, within which it finds itself. Its refuge is there, for it is itself therapeutic. Indeed, it would be happy to see the Church, along with itself, absorbed into it. This is its ideal. It sees itself as a pioneer of such absorption. This is its role at the present time. Therefore, in the name of "pluralism", it would seek entrance for therapeutic man within the Church, the acceptance, then tolerance, of his outlook by the Church; then, finally, the submission of the Church to the therapeutic outlook in the name of "democracy"; by which is meant, in fact, enforced homogeneity and the suppression as anti-social of particular beliefs. Democracy, in the eyes of the Progressive Establishment, is invaluable as an instrument for the dethronement of Ecclesiastical Authority; so, too, is the existence of a parallel *magisterium* of theologians, as we have already noted earlier on in this article. In the same way, "ecumenism" is desired as a means of shredding divinely revealed truth in the interests, ultimately, of a vague, humanitarian "togetherness"—the secular ecumenism of the World Council of Churches with which too many in the Church — some of them in high places—have flirted too dangerously for far too long.

The New Totalitarianism

A permissive Church within a permissive world, at the service of self-contained, autonomous man—this is the goal of the Progressive Establishment within the Catholic Church today. Neither would it hesitate—when the time was thought right and as a means of last resort—to invoke the power of the State to bring this about. Contemporary American experience points unerringly in this direction, as Professor Hitchcock shows so well in some of the most telling pages of his book. This could be the new totalitarianism—a word made safe for secularist man and within which the Church is tolerated for so long and only for so long as it serves his supposed interests. This is the nightmare vision. For those prepared to see, this is the world into which the Church has been slipping. This is the world from whose embrace Pope John Paul has set about the great task of freeing the Church. Opposed to him are those same dissident priests and religious whose original absorption into secularism has wrought such havoc in the Church. The public support he should be receiving from his bishops appears to me at the moment as conspicuous by its absence. The Holy Father appears to me as very much alone in the giant task he has set himself. In fact he is not, for priests and people throughout the Church are with him by the million. The Pope needs to know this. Why not write and tell him so? It would be good, so very good, if readers of *Christian Order* made a start; simply thanked the Holy Father for what he is doing and assured him of their prayers.

“It looks as if we have returned to the times of Pius X”, said one (Vatican) prelate. Others are so shocked that they refuse to comment — *Sunday Telegraph* 23/12/79 :

“Ah well”, said Cardinal X

“These things are sent to try us !

We did so hope

For a nice quiet Pope,

And we’ve got another Pius !”

S.G.

This article was prompted by a layman's reaction to the Midnight Mass with which he found himself confronted last Christmas in his home parish. Others, we feel very sure, have similar experiences. The article that follows is in reasoned and wholly justified protest against current liturgical excess.

A Cause for Dissatisfaction

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

ADRIAN P. KILROY

DURING the Christmas period there was a programme on the radio in which the BBC repeated a talk given by Graham Greene on the life and work of the great novelist, Evelyn Waugh. In this programme, Graham Greene remarked on how, towards the end of his life, Waugh became increasingly depressed by the direction in which the Church was heading. That was in the mid-1960's. How would he have felt today in 1980? How many of us there must be who feel not just depressed, but embittered, at the downhill trends of the present-day Church. In the Mass we see the cheap gimmickry that the Church has imported from America, in the teaching of the Church we see the old standards constantly being watered down and replaced by modern "free-thinking" attitudes.

Liturgy and Doctrine

Regarding the alterations made to the Church since Vatican II, many Catholics are of the opinion that it is more "meaningful" and "relevant", so long as the essential doctrine of the Church is not altered. I beg to oppose this view. The Liturgy and the manner in which the Mass is said involve an overt expression to the Faithful of the teaching of the Church, and also the attitudes of the

clergy. If changes there must be, they should come from the highest authority and affect the *whole* Church, not just localised areas. They must represent a step forward and they must be in harmony with the essential nature of the Church and its fundamental precepts. The unity of all Catholics must be protected.

Yet has it been? In recent years, the catholicity of the Church has been severely endangered by the abandonment of the one, universal Latin language and the introduction of the vernacular. With the old rite removed, liturgical chaos ensued and progressive clergy were able to secure considerable freedom to say Mass according to their own whims. This is fast producing a situation similar to that of the Anglican Church, in that many Catholics are compelled to travel to different churches for Mass because they are dissatisfied with their own priest; or indeed, they become disillusioned and do not go to church at all. (That Mass attendance is declining has been confirmed by Rev. Michael Clifton in the November 1979 edition of *Christian Order*.)

Why this Dissatisfaction?

Why is there this dissatisfaction? Primarily, because there is little beauty or dignity remaining in the Mass. Poverty of translation is one factor. Another is the loss of plainsong: it is symptomatic of the present age that men should fail to appreciate anything beautiful or of value, and should cast it aside. The lilting tones, the rich cadences and the enchanting melodies made the chant not only intrinsically beautiful in itself, but also a source of deep spiritual inspiration. Not only was it written and composed by Saints and Doctors of the Church, but also it has been sung in every Catholic church and monastery around the world for nearly one thousand five hundred years—that is until a few years ago. Now what do we have?—Guitars and cheap American tunes.

Confession and Communion

Changes in the Liturgy reflect also a changing attitude to two of the most important Sacraments—Confession and Holy Communion. In the first case, many priests would prefer to see Confession in private abolished and a general Confession incorporated into the Mass. In the case of Holy

Communion, it is not a question of preference — the progressives have so far achieved what they wanted, and they have achieved it subtly, little by little.

First of all, we were told that, as an “alternative” to receiving the Eucharist on the tongue, the laity were permitted to take it in the hands. Far from being any alternative, this irreverent practice is now taught in our schools as the *correct* way to receive Communion. Secondly, why do some priests encourage the people to stand, rather than kneel, at Communion? One of its effects is to reduce subconsciously our respect for the Eucharist. Surely we have all noticed how many people transfer the Eucharist from the hand to the tongue while they are walking *away* from the altar? Thirdly, of course, is the latest and most momentous change — the new ability of the laity to administer the Eucharist, even women.

It is because of such considerations as these, and more besides, that many good-thinking Catholics believe the Church to be in decline. They feel that the root cause of this decline to be intrinsically connected with the abandonment of Latin as a liturgical language. And they are probably right. Certainly, all the present-day causes for dissatisfaction seem ultimately to stem from the same thinking and the same frame of mind that discarded the one, universal language of the Church in preference for the multi-lingual jumble we now have.

(I do not here wish to go into these “causes for dissatisfaction” in great depth, but we all know the sort of thing I mean: the lowering of moral standards within the Church, the decreasing emphasis on the priesthood and the Hierarchy in general, the corresponding increase of emphasis on the introduction of democratic principles within the Church and on participation of the laity, the lack of clear and positive teaching in morals and doctrine, and, of course, the loss of Latin and the encouragement of folk music and such dubious practices as charismatic prayer groups and Masses in the home.)

The “Needs of Modern Man”

Many people yearn for the old rite, not merely in preference for Latin, but also because they feel betrayed and they feel embittered. They grew up with a Mass which was

beautiful and inspiring, they grew up with a Church which constantly looked towards God, which was ever aware that this life is but a passing phase. Now this has been destroyed by foolish men who claimed it did not meet the so-called "needs of modern man". This is a phrase which is cited almost like clockwork by the progressives, but what exactly does it mean? What do these needs consist of?

Let us, rather, look at this question from the other angle: what does modern man no longer need? We can answer this simply by looking at the present-day orientation of the Church—the priest is no different from the ordinary people. Hence, he should not wear vestments or a dog-collar. We do not want plainsong, nor incense, nor to worry about touching the Host with our hands; in fact, we do not need any of the old marks of respect for our God. We do not really want the priest to interfere with people's private morals—a "do-what-you-like" attitude is by far the safest and best because you can accommodate everybody then—and besides, in some matters, marriage for example, the priest is hardly in a position to dictate proper conduct. Nor, of course, do we need personal Confession—a general Confession now and then will be quite sufficient.

And so it goes on. "Meeting the needs of modern man" turns out to be nothing more than pandering to the tastes and materialistic desires of modern society, a society which does not want to be put to too much trouble. Folk hymns and charismatic meetings are nothing but a distorted and dissolute attempt to "sell" religion to an age which is wrought with a desire for personal satisfaction. "Mass is something we should go to in order to enjoy" is a popular saying. Certainly, the celebration of the Mass is something joyful. But the Church must take care that the Mass is not degraded into an hour's mere entertainment. For this is exactly what the progressives seem to be doing. This was confirmed for me by an acquaintance of mine who was going to a house-Mass for the first time. He said to me: "I have never been to one before. Do you think I ought to take a bottle of something with me?"

Responsibility of Priests and Clergy

Beauty, dignity, austerity, reverence, warmth, devotion—these are the qualities every good Catholic nowadays asso-

ciates with the Latin Mass. Yet however much the Latin may have contributed to the overall ecclesiastical atmosphere of the old rite, it must ultimately be the priests and clergy who are responsible for the presence—or the absence—of these qualities. Incense, vestments, the ritual may all be conducive to inspiring the right religious feeling, but by themselves they stand for nothing. We have only to witness Catholic-oriented services in non-Catholic churches for confirmation of this. Technically speaking then, the Mass should still “feel” the same even without the old ritual. But we all know it does not.

The point I am making throughout is simply this: since Vatican II, the Liturgy has not merely been “up-dated”; far more important is that, where many priests and religious are concerned, basic attitudes on fundamental questions and the whole general framework of thinking are being altered . . . from within.

A Christmas Midnight Mass

Let me describe for you Christmas Midnight Mass at my own parish church, which did more to encourage bitterness and enmity than to foster the true Christmas spirit.

First, the general organisation of the Mass was lamentable. It was apparent that nobody taking part—neither the altar boys, nor the members of the congregation had been told what to do. The procession to the crib broke down because the cross-bearer did not know which way they were supposed to be going. Four children from the congregation read the bidding prayers. Only one of them could read out loud, and none of them knew what to do when they had finished their turn, whether to leave the sanctuary individually or as a group. A family of four went up to the altar with the offertory gifts. At the altar, the woman entered into a personal conversation with the priest, and, from where I was positioned at the front, it seemed she was wishing him a Happy Christmas! For one thing it is completely irresponsible of the clergy to encourage members of the congregation to take part in the service in this way only to make fools of themselves. A badly organised service does nothing to foster spiritual harmony—it reflects the present disorder in the Church. And besides, it

is a direct insult to God. Have Catholics forgotten what happens on the altar during Mass? Do they no longer wonder at the miracle before their very eyes? For this is certainly what the behaviour of priests and laity alike suggests.

Secondly, I was well aware that the curate at church was somewhat progressive in his thinking, but I hardly expected to find a group of girls sitting in front of the altar rails and equipped with guitars and music stands (stands which, incidentally, caused havoc at Communion and had to be taken out). Nor was I quite prepared to discover a nun positioned at the head of the centre aisle brandishing a microphone, through which she advertised her vocal ability in the form of carols and folk hymns. Her function, apparently, was to lead the singing. Apart from the carols, the music, chosen from the worst element of the *Celebration Hymnal*, was offensive and lacking in any form of dignity. I am shocked that anyone could want deliberately to debase the Mass so much, and on a feast day so respected and revered as Christmas.

Soon after Communion, I took my leave and walked out of the church — out of the frying-pan into the fire: my feeling of depression turned immediately to one of shock and horror. Evidently, the priest, in a blind endeavour to attract the youth of the parish to church, had hit upon the answer: he had organised a discotheque in the church hall for that evening. But the effect turned sour, as any sane person might have predicted. For in the entrance foyer, and around the doorways, against the church-wall, and in the carpark, there were countless teenagers in drunken revelry, either drinking out of cannisters, or necking with their partners. Two policemen were in evidence keeping an eye on the situation.

No one is surprised if there is an occasional drunk at Midnight Mass, but to find fifty or sixty drunken teenagers at the back of church, that the police should have to be involved—and all through the encouragement of the priest—is absolutely intolerable. What easy prey for the enemies of the Church!

The sooner *all* Catholics return to more sober thinking the better.

The General Conference of the Latin American Episcopate at Puebla came to an end on February 13th, 1979. In the June/July (1979) number of *Christian Order* we published the message addressed by the Bishops, who attended the Conference, to the peoples of Latin America.

Later last year what is called the Puebla Document was published in Spanish. It is divided into five main sections, contains 1309 numbered paragraphs and, in the official Spanish version, runs to 284 pages. By now, the English translation is available.

For the interest of readers we publish below a summary of nine passages from the Puebla Document which are more closely concerned with the promotion of justice and the social, political and economic factors affecting it. Grateful thanks are extended to those responsible for the summary.

Puebla: Promotion of Justice

(1) VIEW OF REALITY (# # 27-50)

AFTER identifying themselves with the outlook and position adopted by Medellin "which was the inspiration for so many of our pastoral letters during the past decade" (25), the Bishops state that they wish to share the anxieties and sufferings of all the people whatever their social condition. However they are especially concerned with 2 types:

Sufferings that stem from poverty

Growing gap between rich and poor.

The luxury of the few which is an insult to the misery of the masses.

A situation of 'social sin', all the more serious in countries calling themselves catholic.

A poverty caused by structures that need to be changed.
A poverty visible in the faces of children, youth, indigenous peoples, peasants, workers, unemployed, slum-dwellers and the aged.

Sufferings that stem from violations of human dignity

Permanent violation of many fundamental human rights.
Abuses of power, including torture, exile + assassination.
Lack of participation in socio-political life.

Institutionalized injustice.

Excesses due to the free-market economy, marxism and the ideology of national security.

Models of development that discriminate against the poor.

(2) ROOT CAUSES (# # 63-70)

The Bishops, expressing their desire to help bring about necessary changes, mention 7 factors that cause or contribute to the unjust situation described above :

Economic systems that do not give priority to man as centre of society.

Lack of integration between Latin American countries which weakens their voice on the world scene.

Economic, technological, political and cultural dependence which is aggravated by multinational corporations and the loss of raw materials.

The arms race, "the great crime of our age".

Lack of structural reforms in agriculture and land ownership,

Crisis in moral values which includes public and private corruption, and lack of social conscience, and a capital- and brain-drain.

At the bottom of all this is the mystery of sin in a world impregnated by materialist values.

(3) INADEQUATE CONCEPTS OF HUMAN NATURE (# # 308-315)

Before outlining the christian concept of man, the Bishops describe 5 incomplete and therefore false concepts of human nature current in Latin America :

Determinist

Man is prisoner of magic or occult forces which control his existence. This leads to fatalism and acceptance of the *status quo*.

Psychological

Man is victim of his instincts, especially erotic. This leads to 'pansexualism' and justification of 'machismo'.

Economic—there are 3 versions :

Consumerist : Man is a mere consumer and unit of production.

Liberal : Economic efficiency is all that matters and man is no more than an individual cipher.

Marxist : Only the collectivity matters and this is determined by its economic structures.

Statist

National security is the over-riding concern of the State and takes precedence over all other aspects of life.

Scientific

Man is subordinated to technology and social engineering.

(4) HUMAN DIGNITY (# # 316-320)

It is a serious duty for us to proclaim to all the rights due to each and every person but which we see so often violated.

Every man and woman, however insignificant, every human life in any condition has a value which commands unconditional respect.

We condemn any threat to, diminution or violation of the unalienable rights of the human person.

The mystery of human nature only becomes intelligible through faith in Jesus Christ, though we join with all men of good will in our defence of human dignity.

For us a bold profession of our faith and effective action to defend human rights go together.

(5) INTEGRAL LIBERATION (# # 326-329)

An essential condition for human dignity is man's integral liberation on 3 different but inseparable levels : "in his relationship to the world, as master; to other men, as brother; and to God, as son." (322)

Man accepts sonship of God through grace or rejects it by sin. Both choices have direct effects on the other two relationships.

Love of God necessarily implies love for other men which today means justice for the oppressed and liberation of those in need.

In Latin America today it is impossible to love one's brother, and therefore God, without committing oneself personally, and often even at structural levels, to the service of the most needy and neglected.

Man's personal rejection of God leads to the greed, pride, ambition and envy which cause all sorts of injustice, domination and violence.

We must therefore free ourselves from this sin which destroys human dignity by sharing in the new life that comes through Jesus Christ.

Maintaining the link between these 3 levels enables us to avoid both the verticalism of a disincarnate spirituality and the horizontalism of purely human or socio-economic relationships.

(6) THE GOSPEL THAT FREES (# # 485-488)

The message of integral liberation cannot, in Latin America, be separated from the message of the Gospel itself.

Without liberation from sin that Christ won for us on the Cross we cannot speak of true liberation.

Nor is it true if it excludes the liberation that enables man to become the subject of his own development and free himself from the dependency and servitude that deprive him of his rights.

It is achieved not through violence or the class struggle but the determined action of christians moved by the Spirit.

It is all the more important to emphasise liberation today because, in the years since Medellin, the situation has got worse in most of our countries.

We are happy to see so many examples of efforts to live this liberating evangelization up to the hilt.

(7) THE CHURCH AND IDEOLOGIES (## 542-551)

To free others through the message of the Gospel, the Church itself must remain free with respect to different ideologies. The Bishops describe 3 main ones in Latin America and end with an important declaration of their own independence.

Liberal Capitalism

Leads to the idolatry of wealth in its individualistic form. While enhancing human creativity and progress for some, insistence on the absolute right to private property has lead to scandalous contrasts, dependence and oppression, both national and international.

Marxism

Leads to the idolatry of wealth in its collective form.

In its historic expressions has always taken the form of totalitarian regimes closed to any possibility of criticism or modification.

As for distinguishing between theory and analysis, *Octogesima Adveniens* emphasises the close link between the two.

A theology built on a praxis which stems from marxist analysis therefore runs the risk of itself becoming an ideology.

Natural Security

A recent ideology linked to a vertical and elitist politico-economic model which excludes the participation of the people.

Claims to defend the true values of western christian civilization.

Leads to repression and, in some cases, geopolitical aggression.

Moderate and answerable organs for national security are legitimate and necessary.

A system based on control by military or political elites which accentuates inequalities and blocks participation is not christian.

The Church

The Bishops quote Medellin to show that both liberal capitalism and marxism undermine human dignity and that therefore Latin America must not be held to a choice between the two.

They then quote the Opening Address of John Paul II :
"The Church wishes to stay free with regard to the competing systems, in order to opt only for man. Whatever the miseries or sufferings that afflict man, it is not through violence, the interplay of power or political systems, but through the truth concerning man that humanity will find the path towards a better future." (551)

(8) PREFERENTIAL OPTION FOR THE POOR (# # 1153-1165)

In the present situation of Latin America, an option for man rather than a particular ideology cannot take any other form than a preferential option for the poor. The Bishops reconfirm the option taken in Medellin and recall Vatican II's insistence that: "Not only the effects but also the causes of various ills must be removed. Help should be given in such a way that the recipients may gradually be freed from dependence on others and become self-sufficient." They then explain what this option means in practice :

Aims

Our aim is to announce Christ who shared our human condition in poverty and carried his good news especially to the poor.

Owing to the scandalous inequalities in Latin America, we need this message if we are to build a just and free society.

Social, political and economic structures must be changed, but also the personal and collective attitudes of people through conversion.

Our solidarity with the poor should help free them also from individualism and false ideals.

Similarly the Church's own witness of poverty should help to convert the wealthy.

Means

The Church must revise its own structures and the life of its members, especially those engaged in pastoral activity.

This conversion calls for an austere life and a reliance on God's power rather than that of secular authority.

It also means being open to the poor, recognising their value, being willing to let them participate.

Action

We condemn the extreme poverty of many sectors of our continent as being against the Gospel.

We want to understand and denounce the mechanisms responsible for it.

We hope to work with other churches and all men of good will to build a more just world.

We support the aspirations of workers and peasants to be treated as free and responsible people shaping their own future.

We defend their fundamental right freely to form organisations to promote their interests and the common good. We commit ourselves to protect and foster indigenous cultures and peoples.

We wish our preferential option for the poor to bring new hope for all.

(9) THE CHURCH'S ACTION (# # 1257-1293)

Before their general conclusion in Part 5, the Bishops summarize the main actions the Church should take at national and international level. Once again they assess the *situation*, identify *criteria* or goals for action, and outline the *services* the Church should offer. The section is given here in greater detail.

(a) Situation

National

Latin American man lives in a social situation that contradicts the fact that he is an inhabitant of a largely christian continent.

The root cause of this situation is sin, both personal and structural.

The situation of institutionalized violence is getting worse.

Hopes for development have not been realised; the marginalisation and exploitation of the poor have increased. Fundamental human rights are violated from before birth and in all aspects of life.

Assassinations, disappearance, arbitrary imprisonment, terrorism, kidnapping, torture are common throughout the continent.

Agrarian and other reforms are blocked by the concentration of property in a few hands and of power in military or civil technocracies.

International

International mechanisms are also making the rich ever richer and the poor ever poorer.

They operate in societies where egoism is rife, public opinion manipulated and new forms of exploitation disguised.

In many cases multinational corporations escape all control.

Thus the under-development of the hemisphere increases and even becomes endemic.

Continental integration or co-operation is frustrated.

There is a constantly growing number of emigrants, refugees, political exiles and undocumented workers.

Vast masses of peasants, indigenous peoples and the old are abandoned and exploited.

Yet expenditure is rising on arms and imported luxuries.

(b) Criteria

National

The Church, "except in humanity", must become "the voice of the voiceless" in her defence and promotion of the fundamental human rights of individual and community against society and of weak nations against powerful.

This will call for denunciation that is objective, courageous and based on the Gospel: it should be a collegial exercise in solidarity.

An indispensable part of the Church's mission to evangelize is to proclaim basic human rights now and in the future. Among them are the following:

Individual rights to life, physical integrity, legal protection, religious freedom, freedom of opinion, sharing in goods and services, accession to property, etc.

Social rights to education, association, work, health, development, good government, social freedom and justice, participation in decisions concerning peoples and countries.

Emergent rights to a good reputation, privacy, objective information, conscientious objection, etc.

International

Both the imbalance of international society and the defence of the individual in a new international order oblige the Church to labour for certain rights such as :

The right to just relations between nations and full respect for their economic, political and cultural self-determination.

The right of each nation to defend and promote its own interests in the face of multinational corporations which should be submitted to some form of international control.

The right to a new international cooperation based on new conditions.

The right to a new international order based on solidarity and justice.

This new international order will not accept neo-malthusian criteria, will be based on legitimate social needs, will recognise a healthy pluralism, and will preserve the common patrimony of humanity especially the oceans.

Any economic surpluses, savings from disarmament or other excess wealth should be used for the integral development of the weakest.

Every attempt must be made to promote greater unity in Latin America where we have so much in common.

(c) Services

As part of its mission to evangelize, the Church must form together with all men of good will an ethical conscience concerning major world problems. Thus it will :

give evangelical witness to the presence of God in history;

set up organisations for social action and human promotion;

make up as far as possible for defects in public social services;

improve and create new international mechanisms to guarantee the genuine progress of the growing number of the abandoned.

Episcopal Conferences should undertake joint studies of these problems.

The Church should devote special care to refugees, migrants, exiles and undocumented workers so that they can

lead a full life and not remain second class citizens. The Church calls on all countries and humanitarian organisations :

- to attack the roots of the unemployment problem;
- to respect and strengthen the right to asylum;
- to honour their quotas for refugees and emigrants;
- to cooperate in times of catastrophe;
- to work towards a general amnesty;
- to set up centres for the defence of the human person.

We wish to encourage and help all who are afflicted and have their human rights violated.

BRITON'S CATHOLIC LIBRARY

Presents

THE LIVES OF THE FATHERS, MARTYRS, AND OTHER PRINCIPAL SAINTS

by

Reverend Alban Butler

Due to the virtual disappearance of the original *Lives of the Saints* by Alban Butler, Briton's Catholic Library intends to republish the old masterpiece in a beautifully hardbound two-volume set, containing 64 traditional illustrations in a total of 2024 pages. The unsurpassing quality of the original over later editions is at once manifest and remarkable. This treasure of Catholic doctrine, morals, liturgy, history and piety will be republished if enough interest is shown by prospective buyers. The price will be £25.00 (U.S., Canada and Australia : \$50.00). Readers and potential buyers are urged to write us and express their interest : 44 Bloomsbury Square, London, WC1A 2RA.

Book Review

DEMOLITION WORK

The Religious Education Commission of the Diocese of East Anglia has recently published a twelve-page booklet entitled *Clearing the Site; a Practical Approach to Confession*. No date of publication is given, nor is it quite clear whom this booklet is aimed at; the young adult, reluctant to make use of this Sacrament or the older adult, still confessing in a childish way.

From time to time, books have been written with the intention of helping Catholics make better use of Confession. Perhaps the best was *Pardon and Peace* by Father Aelred Wilson, now notably out of print. It is doubtful whether much of use can be said within twelve pages.

The tone of this booklet is chatty and light-weight. I would not go so far to say that it has nothing useful to say. But much of it has already been said, and said rather better, I would suggest.

Reading between the lines, I get the feeling that once more the arrogant assumption is at least being implied, that we were all wrong in the past, and that now we have reached a stage of enlightenment. It does not seem to occur to the many who think on these lines that, if we were so wrong about many things in the past, then our new teachers may equally be mistaken now. The logic of their assumption appears to escape them.

Let us take a quick look at this booklet. On page 3, we are told that "repentance is about the future more than the past". Is this true? Surely not. There is a confusion between repentance, which concerns what we have done wrong in the past, remote or proximate, and conversion, which concerns our future behaviour. The good old-fashioned term, "purpose of amendment" is never used. Surely this is not too hard for a modern reader to comprehend?

On the credit side, on page 4, it is pointed out that God does not withhold his love when we sin. It is we who are rejecting his love. It might have helped to make more clear the differences between God's love for the sinner and his offer of forgiveness, and his hatred of sin. In fact, the

enormity of sin is nowhere mentioned, nor the distinction between mortal and venial sin. Is that too oldfashioned?

"It is an open secret that people go less often to confession than once they did. And lots of people never go at all", p. 6. (Would it be carping to say that there is no such thing as an open secret?) Having made this statement, the truth of which seems to be born out by the experience of many priests, no real attempt is made to find out why people are not using this Sacrament in great numbers any longer. May it not be because sin is not spoken about much today, the distinction between mortal and venial sin obscured, and the spiritual advantages of frequent confession left unmentioned? The writer was told of an occasion when, after a talk given to girls at a convent school, the headmistress, a nun, said to the priest, "Father we don't talk to the girls about the Commandments". If there are no Commandments then, presumably, there are no sins.

The booklet very rightly points out the dangers of processing groups of children into church for mass confessions. The teachers and priests no doubt meant well but, with older children, there was indeed a danger that through human respect they might go to confession in the habit of grave sin and with no intention whatsoever of changing. Not that this obvious danger is mentioned. However, the custom has been abandoned long ago, I think.

No, the suggestion is that, having made routine confessions from the age of 7 onwards, people are unlikely to change into an adult manner of confessing, unless they read this booklet. I certainly have heard adults confess, not as little children, but in a childish way. I have also been moved by the frank and sincere confessions of some quite young children.

No-one would quarrel with the advice to grow up, and stop producing a list of sins like a shopping list. St. Francis de Sales had some good things to say about this in the *Introduction to the Devout Life*, but he doesn't get a mention. The advice given in this booklet is good as far as it goes, but it doesn't go very far; space being short, presumably.

We are then, on page 7, told not to be obsessed by secrecy. It is not grown up. My own experience is

opposite. It is children who don't care a rap about secrecy. It is adults who have a sense of shame and would, on the whole, prefer not to be seen or recognised by their voice. In fact, not so long ago, priests who were without assistants were urged to exchange confessionals with a neighbouring priest from time to time.

Priests, it is true, usually confess to each other without any anonymity. Possibly, they have a better understanding of sin and the sinner. We are told under the heading "Face to Face" that anonymous confession will always be available, but we should make the most of face-to-face confession if we get the chance. This, for some obscure reason, is more grown-up. I wonder why. I also wonder whether some priests may not get so crazy on the face-to-face confession as to refuse the use of the "box". After all, what priest really likes spending an hour or two cooped up in that way?

"It's far more human to talk to someone you recognise". Personally, I would have no objection to confessing in such a way. I am sure many would, and do, object, and it is unfair to suggest that they are arrested in their development. There are obvious dangers in the "confession room" method, not one of which is mentioned. One danger is that it might degenerate into a counselling chat, with coffee and cigarettes thrown in to make it more "human" and "natural". In any event, this method would mean fewer penitents per hour; and who is going to wait whilst Mrs. Bloggs pours out all her family worries to her priest, whilst forgetting all about her own sins?

"Think of the nightmare of the non-stop Confiteor". We are told to "pack them in, these prayers—you don't need them, if you don't mean them". This is on page 9. But why on earth should we not mean them if we are supposed to be grown-up. The so-called "non-stop Confiteor" was part of the Mass and Compline for ages. Whilst rejecting this prayer as too long, the booklet is keen to point out, as does the Confiteor, that when we sin, we sin against the whole Church in some way.

Under the paragraph, Power in his People, on page 9 still, we are told that the priest is important as well as Jesus Christ, because "he has passed on his power and his

strength to his People, which is the Church". I certainly question the accuracy of that statement. Jesus left the power to forgive sins to the Apostles in the first instance, and although it has no specific mention in the new Ordination Rite, this power is given to a priest by his bishop on the day of his ordination. It does not belong to the "people" in general.

In point of fact, I think this statement on page 9 is the most dangerous thing in the whole booklet. There are quite enough people today who want to say that the faithful confer the powers of the priesthood, and that therefore, of course, Anglican Orders may be valid. Even if we get down to electing someone in the parish to be priest, the laity cannot confer upon such a person his priestly functions. Yet today, there are those who say differently.

Is it true to say that when the priest raises his hand and says, "I absolve you", he is speaking for all your friends in the parish, and all the people on the other side of the world . . . ?" He does not say, "I absolve you in the name of Tom, Jack and Mary and Susan", but "I absolve you in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost". True it is that once we are forgiven and reconciled with God, we are reconciled with the Mystical Body of Christ, which in some way we have damaged by our sins. This is pure Pauline doctrine, but I feel there is a false emphasis here, as in other parts of the booklet.

We are urged to talk about the Sacrament of Reconciliation. What is wrong with the Sacrament of Penance ? Is this some new insight ? Without true repentance, there will be no reconciliation.

"Confession is the normal way of dealing with serious sins". One presumes they mean mortal sins, but don't like to use that word. What, then, is the abnormal way, one may ask ? Surely not by Penitential Services, the last section to be dealt with, on pages 10 and 11.

But, yes, it would appear to be so. They are so valuable because we can tell God altogether, as his family, that we have sinned, and he will pour out his forgiveness on us as long as we are forgiving to each other. What then becomes of the Church's teaching that mortal sins must be confessed

specifically and that the confessor must judge whether the penitent is disposed to receive absolution. Is that discarded now that we are grown-up?

As in so many things these days, there is an over-emphasis on the community of believers and a forgetfulness that we are also individuals, and that we are all different, and cannot be herded and regimented without loss and harm.

Again, I wonder who is expected to gain from a superficial treatment of a difficult subject. If Catholics are not going to confession as they used to, will this booklet help them? Will they even read it? And what of the young, brought up with less clear ideas of sin and the Sacrament of Penance? Will this tiny booklet clear the site for them, and lead them to repentance? One can hardly do anything but doubt it. For them, and for others too, a mention of what is required for grave sin, mortal sin—full knowledge and full consent—might have been helpful. These conditions are not mentioned.

To sum up, there are some good points made in this booklet, but they are dealt with inadequately. There are also some doubtful and dangerous statements. Having recently read a long discourse on religious teaching by Pope John Paul II, where he stresses the need for bishops, priests and all teachers of religion to pass on the Church's teaching and not their own private views or interpretation of this teaching, I just wonder how the Pope would react if he ever saw and read this booklet.

Francis Messiter.

THANKS

to the many who have been renewing on the first reminder right away. Will those with subscription renewals still outstanding please be so kind as to send them in now. Thank you. — The Editor.

CHRISTIAN AFFIRMATION CAMPAIGN

Conference

at

High Leigh Conference Centre, Hoddesdon, Herts

from

May 2nd — May 4th

on

“TO-MORROW’S CHURCH”

Speakers :

Roman Catholic : Michael Davies

“The Religion of Man Made God”

Anglican : Rev. Christopher Wansey

“The Anglican Parish Today & Tomorrow”

Baptist : Edmund Ball

“The Cuckoo of Liberal Theology & the
Marxist Egg”

Charge for Week-end : £14.00

£3 booking-fee and enquiries to :

Sylvia Baker,
57, Park Drive,
Upminster,
Essex.

THE LATIN MASS SOCIETY

FOR THE PRESERVATION OF
THE TRIDENTINE RITE



If you are a reader of
CHRISTIAN ORDER
you should join
THE LATIN MASS
SOCIETY.

The Latin Mass Society
upholds the Latin immemorial Mass
under a Papal Indult.

----- Detach here -----
Please send me further information about THE LATIN
MASS SOCIETY

NAME

ADDRESS.....

.....

THE LATIN MASS SOCIETY

43 BLANDFORD STREET, LONDON W1.

Telephone 01-935 0303 Registered Charity No. 248388